

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

MICHAEL PATRICK YOUNG,  
Plaintiff,  
v.

Case No. 2:25-cv-00352-RFB-EJY

CLARK COUNTY MUNICIPAL JUSTICE  
COURTS; STEIN FORENSIC HOSPITAL,  
Defendants.

## REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

10 This action was initiated on February 24, 2025 when Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, submitted  
11 a Complaint but failed to file an Application to Proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) or pay the filing  
12 fee necessary to commence a civil action. ECF No. 1-1. On April 8, 2025, the Court issued an Order  
13 providing Plaintiff through and including May 6, 2025 to either pay the \$405 filing fee or file a  
14 complete IFP application. ECF No. 10.

15 On May 29, 2025, Plaintiff filed a complete IFP (ECF No. 17), which the Court granted on  
16 June 3, 2025. ECF No. 19. The Court then screened Plaintiff's Complaint. *Id.* The screening  
17 Order dismissed the Complaint without prejudice but with leave to amend no later than June 24,  
18 2025. *Id.* at 3. The Court explained to Plaintiff that failure to comply with the Order would result  
19 in a recommendation to dismiss this action in its entirety. *Id.* As of the date of this Recommendation,  
20 Plaintiff has not complied with the Court's Order; nor has he otherwise communicated with the  
21 Court.

22 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this case be dismissed without  
23 prejudice for failure to comply with the Court's Order.

24 Dated this 1st day of July, 2025.

Elayna J. Youchah  
ELAYNA J. YOUCAH  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

## NOTICE

Under Local Rule IB 3-2, any objection to this Report and Recommendation must be in writing and filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen (14) days. The Supreme Court holds the courts of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified time. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985). The Ninth Circuit also held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal factual issues from the order of the District Court. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); *Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).